

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.                            | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.      | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 09/675,057                                 | 09/29/2000  | Masaharu Tsuboi      | 0505-0692P               | 9453             |
| 7590 12/11/2003                            |             |                      | EXAMINER                 |                  |
| BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP       |             |                      | MULLINS, BURTON S        |                  |
| P O Box 747<br>Falls Church, VA 22040-0747 |             |                      | ART UNIT                 | PAPER NUMBER     |
| ,  |             |                      | 2834                     |                  |
|  |             |                      | DATE MAIL ED. 12/11/2002 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | 1  | I A unit a mater   |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |  |  |  |  |
| Advisory Action  | 09/675,057   | TSUBOI, MASAHARU   |  |  |  |  |
| •  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |  |  |  |  |
|  | Burton S. Mullins  | 2834   |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| THE REPLY FILED 04 November 2003 FAILS TO PLAGE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (*condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appears Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  | ivoid abandonment of this applications application in the standard standard and the standard standard and the standard standard and standard standa | cation. A proper reply to a<br>ch places the application in  |  |  |  |  |
| PERIOD FOR R   | EPLY [check either a) or b)]   |  |  |  |  |  |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WA 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The baye been filed in the date for purposes of determining the period   | <ul> <li>later than SIX MONTHS from the mail</li> <li>S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF</li> <li>e date on which the petition under 37 C</li> <li>of extension and the corresponding an</li> </ul>  | ing date of the final rejection. THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP  CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension nount of the fee. The appropriate extension |  |  |  |  |
| fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Of timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37   | fice later than three months after the m   | ly originally set in the final Office action, or lailing date of the final rejection, even if  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application<br/>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>  | in better form for appeal by ma  | terially reducing or simplifying the   |  |  |  |  |
| (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) woul canceling the non-allowable claim(s).   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims with the proposed amendment of the proposed amendment | nt(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or<br>would be rejected is provided be   | b)⊡ will be entered and an<br>elow or appended.  |  |  |  |  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows  | <b>::</b>  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) objected to: <u>18 and 19</u> .   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-17 and 20</u> .  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10. Other:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | RM   |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Burton S. Mullins<br>Primary Examiner<br>Art Unit: 2834  |  |  |  |  |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

## Continuati n Sheet (PTOL-303)

Continuation of 2. NOTE: Amendments pertaining to "first control board having a substantially flat surface facing away from said motor, the flat surface being directly attached to an inner wall of the casing" (claim 1), the second control board "having a surface larger than a surface of the first control board and entirely" overlapping the first control board (claim 8), and one of the at least one control device "on each of the control boards is mounted so as not to overlap" with the motor (claim 20) are all new issues that require further consideration and search.